



**MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
March 19, 2019**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm.

Present: Mayor: Charlie Miner; Council: Deirdre Kvale, Michelle Jerde, Jahn Dyvik, and Tom Skjaret

Staff Present: City Administrator: Scott Weske; Fire Chief: James Van Eyll; Public Works Director: Sean Diercks; Planning Consultant: Kurt Bearinger, WSB; and City Clerk: Jeanette Moeller

Absent: None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MAYOR'S COMMENTS - LONG LAKE NEWS, MEETING REVIEW AND UPDATES

Mayor Miner offered the following comments and updates:

In an EDA meeting prior to the regular City Council meeting, the EDA had a discussion about the former BP station site and identified a plan to move forward with obtaining estimates for work at the site to include asbestos abatement and preparing for demolition.

Mayor Miner noted it was nice to see spring return, and he is looking forward to the final summer of the County Road 112 construction project getting underway soon.

APPROVE AGENDA

A motion was made by Skjaret, seconded by Jerde, to approve the Agenda as presented. Ayes: all.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda consisted of:

- A. Approve Minutes of March 5, 2019 City Council Meeting
- B. Approve Minutes of March 5, 2019 City Council Work Session
- C. Receive Minutes of February 19, 2019 Economic Development Authority Meeting
- D. Approve Vendor Claims and Payroll

Council member Kvale referenced a payment made to John Hall under the vendor claims list, and questioned who Mr. Hall was.

Administrator Weske clarified that John Hall is an Assistant Fire Chief, and the payment was a reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred while attending a conference.

A motion was made by Dyvik, seconded by Jerde, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Ayes: all.

OPEN CORRESPONDENCE

Mayor Miner noted that the agenda includes a firefighter appointment item and a number of planning cases for review. He encouraged anyone in attendance who wished to share comments on a planning case to step up and voice their comments during the Open Correspondence period.

No one appeared to address the City Council during Open Correspondence.

BUSINESS ITEMS

Appointment of New Firefighters to the Long Lake Fire Department

Fire Chief Van Eyll reported that with two individuals having completed an application and interview process, it is the recommendation of staff that conditional job offers for the position of paid on call firefighter be made to applicants Hue Alexander and Matthew Kulseth. The conditions of the offer are that each new firefighter passes a physical exam, physiological exam, agility test and probationary period. The interview panel consisted of a Fire Lieutenants, District Captain and Assistant Chief. Both candidates would be responding to Station 1.

Mayor Miner expressed his appreciation and thanks to Mr. Alexander and Mr. Kulseth for stepping forward to become firefighters for the City of Long Lake.

A motion was made by Skjaret, seconded by Dyvik, to adopt Resolution No. 2019-16 conditionally appointing the following candidates to the position of paid on-call firefighter for the City of Long Lake Fire Department: Hue Alexander and Matthew Kulseth. Ayes: all.

Planning Case #2019-02 / Request for a Preliminary and Final Plat for a Subdivision Located at 2260 Watertown Road (Applicant: Curt Fretham, Lake West Development)

Planning Consultant Kurt Bearinger, in attendance on behalf of consultant PeggySue Imihy, introduced the application by Curt Fretham and Lake West Development requesting concurrent approval of a preliminary and final plat for the subdivision of the property located at 2260 Watertown Road. The property is located in the R-1 Single Family Residential District and remains guided as Low Density – Residential in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The applicant proposes to divide the single lot into two lots, with both lots meeting the lot requirements for the R-1 zoning district. Bearinger displayed the proposed plat documents as well as a sketch plan depicting an example of how a dwelling would fit on the newly created lot.

At their meeting on March 12, the Long Lake Planning Commission held a public hearing on the application, at which time a letter of support was read aloud by a neighbor. The Commission voted to recommend the City Council adopt a resolution approving the request for a Preliminary and Final Plat for a subdivision located at 2260 Watertown Road subject to the conditions that the engineering comments are addressed and the plat is approved by the City Engineer; that a park dedication fee for the creation of a residential buildable lot is paid to the City; and that the applicant is responsible to record the approved plat with proof of recording provided to the City. Staff recommends approval of the application consistent with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

City Clerk Moeller clarified that at the time a builder applies for a permit to construct a house on the lot, the building and site plan for the proposed house would be reviewed for conformance with R-1 setbacks and lot requirements.

Steven Eggert, planner for Lake West Development, confirmed that the sketch plan displayed was intended to conceptually show how a house would fit on the buildable lot, noting that actual building plans submitted for building review would be in conformance with R-1 standards. He added that with regard to the drainage creek on the site, the builder will be required to install a culvert.

Weske and Council recalled a previous watermain loop issue that existed in the area which was resolved at the time Watertown Road was reconstructed. Weske advised that the new lot would connect to a sewer line on Watertown Road.

A motion was made by Dyvik, seconded by Jerde, to adopt Resolution No. 2019-17 approving the request for a Preliminary and Final Plat for a subdivision located at 2260 Watertown Road with the following conditions: that the engineering comments are addressed and the plat is approved by the City Engineer; that the required park dedication in the amount of \$2,375 for the subdivision and creation of an additional single family residential buildable lot is paid in full to the City; and that the applicant is responsible to record the approved plat with proof of recording provided to the City. Ayes: all.

Planning Case #2019-04 / Request for an Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit for Rowing Club Facilities for the Long Lake Rowing Crew on the Property Located at 1310 West Wayzata Boulevard (Applicant: Long Lake Rowing Crew / Amy Johnson)

Bearinger presented the Long Lake Rowing Crew rowing club's request to amend their current Conditional Use Permit (CUP), opening by displaying a location map of the site and describing its location within the B-3 Lakeshore Business zoning district. The rowing club is requesting an amendment to their CUP to permit the addition of up to five additional temporary equipment racks for use on the site; the ability to add an additional motorized boat launch and install an additional launching dock; a significant expansion to their hours of operation on the lake; and to permit the LLRC to offer rowing sprints races as part of Birch's annual FallFest celebration for no more than two hours on the event date. In review of the application materials submitted, staff found that the application appeared to meet the criteria established for issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendment to the LLRC's CUP at their March 12 meeting. One question was asked regarding whether permitting an additional dock would set a precedent for other lakeshore lots, however, staff explained that this would be permitted as a special circumstance through the CUP process and that does not set precedent. The Planning Commission voted 5-0 to recommend the City Council approve the applicant's request. After the Planning Commission meeting, letters were received by staff and Council voicing concerns regarding the LLRC's proposal to extend their operational hours. Copies of letters received were distributed for Council review at their desks.

Council member Kvale noted for the record that her son is involved in the Long Lake Rowing Crew.

Council member Dyvik stated that applications relative to the lake have a broad impact on residents, noting that he recognized the public hearing notice for the LLRC's application had been sent out via the City Listserv, though he personally had missed seeing the message he received. He read aloud an email he had sent to fellow lake owners advising them of the LLRC's request to amend their CUP, indicating that while the Planning Commission held a hearing and voted to recommend passing the amendment, he has concerns of overreach by the rowing club regarding hours of operation. In his email, he referenced his awareness of other residents' concerns about rowers watching out for other boats, docks, or swimmers. It's been observed that rowing sculls are difficult to see in low light because they are low to the water. In his message, he voiced his concern that the LLRC is growing beyond what the lake can handle, though they have fairly successfully coincided with other activities to date, and he welcomed his message's recipients to provide their comments back to him. Council member Dyvik did receive responses, a number of which were sent just to him. The letters submitted for Council were likely in response to his correspondence as well. Messages generally convey that residents love the rowing club and it is a great addition to the lake, but that expanding club operations on the lake to the level proposed would be a mistake. He referenced concerns about parking, maintaining awareness of the presence of rowers while using the lake, concern for the safety of swimmers and paddle boarders; and shared an experience he'd had where he witnessed

a fast-moving rowing scull hit his swim raft, noting that if swimmers had been there, it could have been a dangerous situation. He would love for the rowing club's operation to continue as is, but is not in favor of the expanded hours, or for allowing the additional launch and treating the club differently than other residential lakeshore lots. He added that there is no screening of the club's site at Birch's from the lake side. Letters and correspondence received agree in their sentiments that they love the LLRC rowing organization, but are concerned the lake isn't large enough to sustain their growth.

Amy Johnson, Director of the LLRC, thanked Mayor and Council members for reviewing their application to amend their CUP, and for the opportunity they have had to row on Long Lake. She noted that one of the club's main goals as they began in 2014 was to be a part of the community, and club members have worked to be good stewards and respectful of the usage of the lake. They also strive to make rowing available to all. In some arenas rowing is viewed as an exclusive sport, but the LLRC desires to enhance the community they row in and attain good stewardship. Part of the reason why they started to look at additional hours is to continue to grow the club's rowing classes offered through Orono Community Education. The LLRC has typically offered five to six Community Education classes; however, this year, their schedule and growth only permits the club to offer two classes. Both those classes are full with people on a waiting list. Requesting broader hours of operation would allow offering additional programming during the week. They've also been asked by the Minnetonka High School program to have a team building event, and there has been discussion of offering opportunities for local groups including Fithaus and Long Lake Fire, but there is not enough time available under their current schedule to add those opportunities of interest. She assured the Council that the LLRC does not intend to be planning programming for all the hours requested, but rather would like to have a broader schedule to help them accommodate a broader base of rowers and to have adults be able to row in the early morning hours. She described the structure of the Community Education classes offered by the club, noting that rowers try to follow a traditional traffic pattern so they are not spread across the whole lake. She observed that the lake is a shared resource, and she is hoping the LLRC can continue to be a part of the community. It has always been their priority to maintain a good relationship with the City.

She also explained that their request for five additional racks was not to add five more 40' scull racks, but to add racks for oars, safety equipment, and to have racking consistent with the terms of their CUP. In terms of concern with screening, racks are currently largely screened from view by the lake due to the topography and tree coverage provided by the Birch's property.

Further, she discussed how expanding hours could permit them to break up masters group rowing into smaller groups, and described the safety guidelines they observe during their organized rowing activities.

As a follow up, Council member Dyvik reflected that he admired the LLRC's intentions and understands they do not intend to take over the lake; however, once the LLRC is gone, a CUP remains on the site in perpetuity. After the LLRC is gone, another club could install nine 40 foot racks based upon the current request. He referred to comments he had received indicating that people are already modifying their lake usage to be neighborly and are waiting to enjoy their water activities until the rowers are gone from the lake. He continues to fear expanding the presence of rowers on the lake may lead to an accident, and he would like to see a balance of lake use continue as it has been.

Council member Skjaret noted that while he was unclear how the City can restrict access to a public waterway, he believed the LLRC was a victim of their own success. He pointed out that Long Lake is a 280 acre lake with only 200 acres usable for boating. He did not understand the special condition for being able to install a second dock, noting that a homeowner would have to get a

variance. Ms. Johnson stated that DNR guidelines permit one dock per 100' feet of lakeshore in a commercial area.

Council member Skjaret suggested that rather than considering approval of five additional racks, maybe two additional racks would be a compromise. He added that he would not object to extending rowing club operation hours in the morning, but he was not in favor of extending evening rowing daily past 5:30 pm. He expressed concern about the volume of lake traffic already on the lake, and he expects lake traffic volumes will only increase in the years ahead.

Ms. Johnson indicated that with regard to the morning hours, they are not anticipating to be out at dark, and would be using required lights if light conditions were low consistent with DNR regulations. Her feedback from Community Education has been that other community members are frustrated they aren't receiving opportunities to participate in classes. She referenced the "heat map" included in their land use application packet, noting that last year the club's operations had drawn nearly 200 people from a wide area to Long Lake, where they also patronized Long Lake's businesses. Approximately 80 to 90 of those were attending Community Education classes. She explained how their request for hours was intended to accommodate offering additional classes and breaking up their adult rowing into smaller groups.

Council member Dyvik asked at what point the LLRC stops growing.

An LLRC member in the audience rose and indicated that the club would have be able to afford additional equipment to grow, and they cannot do so currently.

Ms. Johnson explained that the intent of their CUP request for additional equipment racks was to request an amount so that they would not have to go through the expensive process of amending their CUP in another couple years. Currently they have oars laying on the ground that they would like to hang up nicely, and they would like to put some racking under the Birch's deck.

Rob Burrell, LLRC, stated that in terms of buying boats, when they do have funds to do so they would be updating their existing fleet and buying more expensive boats that would be better in competition. Older boats would remain for classes, and newer boats would be allocated for competition and events.

Council member Skjaret advised that the CUP request would be unlikely to gain the four required votes to approve under the proposed terms, and suggested finding a "happy medium".

City Clerk Moeller confirmed that the Council could adopt a resolution approving a CUP with changes to the conditions. She also suggested perhaps taking Sundays out of the proposed operational schedule, recalling that in the past, it had been noted there are a number of Sunday holidays that take place throughout the summer, and Sundays have been a very family oriented day on the lake.

A motion was made by Skjaret, seconded by Miner, to adopt Resolution No. 2019-15 approving the request to amend the Conditional Use Permit for the Long Lake Rowing Crew to operate a rowing club facility on property located at 1310 W Wayzata Boulevard, with the following changes to the conditions of approval:

Up to two additional temporary racks may be used to store equipment and oars.

No changes to the two motorized boats permitted.

The dock and boat lift must be in compliance with DNR standards, deleting "limited to 4 slips".

Hours of operation shall be limited to Monday – Thursday, 6:00 am to 5:30 pm; 7:00 am to 12:00 noon on Fridays and Saturdays; and evening sessions for adult rowers permitted from 5:30 pm to 8:00 pm three days during the week.

Any events or regattas require permitting, excepting the two-hour rowing sprints races during Birch's FallFest.

Roger Adams, Planning Commission Chair, confirmed that the Planning Commission had indeed recommended approval of the application by a unanimous vote. Whether in City Code or in DNR regulations, the rule of thumb has been that a single family residence may have one dock, and for multi-family or commercial you may have one dock per 100 feet of shoreline. There is at least 400 feet of shoreline at Birch's. He observed that rowing is a healthy and environmentally sensitive unique activity. Personally, he is in agreement with Council member Skjaret's earlier comment reflecting that the waters belong to the public. If someone wants to be out fishing in front of his dock all day, he cannot tell them to move. Rowers could bring 30 boats to the public landing to launch and go rowing. Permitting the rowing club's operation within a CUP is reasonable because the City can exert some control. He is a regular lake user and the rowers have never been a concern of his. His concern is actually ski boats, wake boats, and boats that increase the turbidity of the water, decrease water quality, and cause shoreline erosion. Boats create waves that can top his dock, and he cannot control that. He indicated he had spent many hours maintaining his shoreline and has lost three feet mostly from wake activity seen during his lifetime. He commented that the lake is a shared resource and he understands the Council's commitment to safety. It is the responsibility of any motorized craft to watch out for other vehicles. Non-powered craft actually have the right of way. He encouraged collaboration and cooperation, adding that the LLRC has been sensitive in how they use the lake.

After further discussion at length of operational hours and docking arrangements, Council member Skjaret amended his motion.

A motion was made by Skjaret, seconded by Miner, to adopt Resolution No. 2019-15 approving the request to amend the Conditional Use Permit for the Long Lake Rowing Crew to operate a rowing club facility on property located at 1310 W Wayzata Boulevard, with the following changes to the conditions of approval:

Up to two additional temporary racks may be used to store equipment and oars.

No changes to the two motorized boats permitted.

The dock condition under the current CUP remains, with no second dock permitted.

Hours of operation shall be limited to Monday – Thursday, 6:00 am to 5:30 pm; 7:00 am to 12:00 noon on Fridays and Saturdays; and on three weekday evenings from 5:30 pm to 8:00 pm.

Any events or regattas require permitting, excepting the two-hour rowing sprints races during Birch's FallFest.

Council member Skjaret noted that he did not see any conflict with Council member Kvale voting on the application, adding that there is no perceived financial gain or benefit should she vote on the request. Fellow Council members were in agreement that they did not see any conflict of interest that would require her to abstain from voting.

Ayes: Kvale, Jerde, Miner, Skjaret. Abstain: Dyvik. Motion carried.

Mayor Miner thanked everyone for their participation in the discussion.

Planning Case #2019-03 / Request for the Review of a Concept Plan for a Planned Unit Development Located at 1843, 1877, 1885, and 1895 Symes Street (Applicant: Ben Landhauser)

Bearinger reported that the applicant's request is for review of a Concept PUD for a proposed redevelopment of four parcels currently zoned R-3, designated as downtown village mixed use in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed development would be for a cooperative living community with units owned by individuals who are 62 years of age and older, and would be consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan future use designated for the site. The lots would meet minimum lot requirements for PUD zoning.

The proposed development would require a variance to building height as the maximum allowable height in the district is 35 feet, and the proposed height would vary from 35 feet to 44.5 feet due to topographical conditions at the site. The developer has shown an eight-foot step back of the top floor would be included on the front façade to lessen the visual impact of the height.

The conceptual site plans currently do not designate a place for guest parking. The site plan currently includes 31 on street parking spaces; however, no overnight on street parking is permitted in Long Lake.

Bearinger displayed multiple renderings of the site and proposed project as provided by the applicant, including a depiction of how topographical changes would affect building height in different building corners.

A Concept PUD application does not require action, but is intended as an open dialogue for Council to provide the developer with some feedback on how he can make the best proposal possible. The Planning Commission did meet on March 12 and were generally supportive of the concept; however, they had some questions regarding the on street parking and were open to seeing the building shifted towards Lake Street and away from Symes Street even if a variance were required to do so.

Ben Landhauser, President of Development with Lifestyle Communities, also introduced Tim Nichols, Principal for Lifestyle Communities. Their intent in presenting a concept back in front of the Council was to share that they believe the site represents a good opportunity for their product, and that it would be of benefit to the community. He pointed out that at the Planning Commission, comment was made that the applicant is really trying to help the City realize a vision held for the downtown for a very long time. The City's Comprehensive Plan guides the downtown as an area for multi family density and mixed uses. As a developer, they are open to things that could come about from their project that would benefit Long Lake as a whole through additional improvements, noting that making extra parking available in the downtown came up as one potential improvement area. Parking calculations would be met for residents by the internal parking arrangement already included inside the building. Their proposal did depict 31 diagonal on street parking spots as a way in their mind to work towards a public benefit to be realized through development of the site. If the City were to prefer parking to be made available in a different area, they would be open to a conversation about moving the building into the setback area and foregoing the diagonal spaces on the north side. Mr. Landhauser also responded to Council questions regarding the size and dimensions of the parking spaces, and explaining that the parking spots are diagonal parking versus head-in parking.

Council member Kvale believed the spots should still be considered head in parking, and questioned the difference between the types.

Council member Skjaret commented that head in parking is at a 90 degree angle to a street and is not allowed in the state, as it requires vehicles to back out crossing two lanes of traffic. Diagonal parking only is allowed, which involves vehicles backing only into one lane of traffic.

Council member Kvale asked if the number of residential units proposed could be reduced to 12 to 15 units, and questioned whether Ecumen or Lifestyle Communities is behind the project.

Mr. Landhauser clarified that Ecumen would be a financial partner, and the project proposal is by Lifestyle Communities. Mr. Nichols indicated that he is the Principal for Lifestyle Communities.

Council member Kvale asked Mr. Nichols to explain what had occurred with a development they'd undertaken with Gramercy in Edina, as the project had gone bankrupt and people lost money.

Mr. Nichols explained that in a previous development in Edina, they had developed a building as the downturn of the real estate economy took place, and they did have a lender that was insolvent. The lender was seized by federal agencies and closed down. With their lender's insolvency, the developer had to do their best to function in a bad economy to the satisfaction of parties involved while leaving the homeowners untouched.

Council member Kvale continued her line of questioning regarding the financial experiences and history of the Edina development and resulting bankruptcy.

Mr. Nichols concluded that he took the loss and suffered financially to assure the homeowners did not. He remains proud of the building they built. His reputation is stellar, and they've had one failure among many successes. Financial guarantor Ecumen has a 150 year long reputation, and they are a very good and financially stable partner. His company has a good reputation with cooperative housing.

Mr. Landhauser indicated they appreciated the ability to come before the Council with a concept and gain the Council's feedback. Great feedback had been received from the Planning Commission, some questions were asked about stormwater management due to the size and scale of the building, and that is where having the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District oversee stormwater management is of benefit to the community. The final specific building design is not complete, but their concept was to depict what would be financially sound for the project. If they do come back with a more formal application, they would have more detailed information to share regarding how stormwater management will be addressed and how final building dimensions may differ.

Mr. Landhauser also shared that with regard to a potential TIF request, at this time they have soil information for half of the site. Borings had been completed in half the site which showed that while soils are not contaminated, they are not conducive to multi-story development and include layers of silt and sand. They have no information at this time on a specific TIF request, but if they decide to move forward, they would be doing a complete analysis of soils to determine if soils were supportive, and that would impact the amount of the request which would be focused on soil stabilization for building development. He noted that if the City were interested in undertaking a street reconstruction project in the vicinity of the project while it was underway, he believed the City could use TIF funds to pay for those improvements and with the tax increment the building could produce, the City could essentially reconstruct the streets on taxes to be paid by their project. Those would be the two main areas of focus in a TIF application. Currently initial information from half the site suggests there would likely be a need for soil correction, and without complete information, it is unknown whether their budget will allow for offsetting those costs. He confirmed that the solution could involve soil correction or driving piles, and noted that in the partial soil reports, in some samples results detected traces of silt up to 30 feet deep.

Council member Jerde overall liked the proposal, noting it would look great on Virginia Avenue. She added that they prepared a great presentation.

Council member Dyvik commented that concepts for Symes Street before have been large-scale. One previous proposal by a developer for more of a medium density had generated more positive feedback. He asked if the large-scale concepts were a result of projects needing to be that size to make it worth it.

Mr. Landhauser responded that the range of 45 to 48 units would be the sweet spot for them. This site would be the smallest cooperative they've done yet. The current proposed building height may be able to be adjusted once full engineering is complete. They also purposely designed it in kind of an E-shape to break up the façade on Symes Street and prevent one continuous face. He sought some direction from the Council as to whether they would like the applicant to continue moving forward. Their interest is in this particular site at this time, and they have not looked at the Virginia Avenue site.

Council member Dyvik stated that he does like the active senior demographic, which is likely to be low crime, bring economy to local businesses, and not burden schools. Those are positive factors. As baby boomers age there will be a growing need for this type of project. The building shown as a concept is an attractive building; however, it is just bigger than he would like to see at a site located next to a park and surrounded by single family residences.

Council members referenced both Virginia Avenue and the former Burger King property as potential site alternatives.

Council member Skjaret commented that he had been listening to proposals for the site for more than a decade. Echoing Planning Commission comments, this is the type of development guided for this area by the Comprehensive Plan. It was his opinion that not to allow a developer to go forward would be disingenuous. To him, height makes no difference. He does have some concern about the massing of the project. He would only encourage them to go forward, recognizing that they have a lot of information they have yet to gather on the site. He noted they have awareness of MCWD requirements for stormwater management and would need to address that. He also would be open to discussion of shifting the building footprint. He would also be supportive of a TIF application. He added that Council member Dyvik is right, the active senior group is a growing segment with growing housing needs, and as the developer has demonstrated with other developments, the units sell out very quickly. On the financial side, there would have to be further discussions about bonding and guarantees.

Mayor Miner's feedback was that the project would serve a demographic he would love to have in the community, contributing to the community and its businesses. He personally has an uncle who lives in an Ecumen project and loves it. Parking was identified years ago as being a problem in the downtown area, and he appreciated the developer's interest in partnering with the City to increase parking opportunities. Regarding the massing, it would be nice to scale it down a bit and decrease the appearance of the massing through softening colors or other measures. The proposal's design did a nice job of checking boxes as far as the City's Design Guidelines. Height is not a big concern of his, and stepping back the top level makes a difference visually. He reflected that as a Council, in general, the developer's interest in the community and in Long Lake is appreciated.

Mr. Landhauser asked if moving forward in pursuing the site, would there be general openness to having a conversation about TIF.

Moeller suggested that the EDA would be best venue for a TIF conversation.

Mr. Landhauser recognized that the Council is trying to focus on the details, and he appreciated their time. He indicated he would discuss the feedback in communication with Administrator Weske.

OTHER BUSINESS

Carp Biomass Removal – Council member Dyvik had spoken with Cassy Ordway regarding the LLWA's attempts at scheduling a carp biomass removal, and learned that the carp's movements have been changing and they will now likely be scheduling an open water netting. Carp movements will continue to be monitored and the plan remains to be to conduct a carp removal when conditions are right to do so.

Landscaping Project Preparation – Council member Dyvik had sent an email to the CR 112 Landscaping Subcommittee members for review of some items in preparation for Hoffman & McNamara to being the Phase 1 landscaping project. He noted that there remains an issue of who will be responsible for project oversight. Weske suggested consideration of a subcommittee meeting to discuss an updated proposal received from SRF. There may be opportunity for project oversight to take place between SRF and Public Works Director Diercks. Council member Dyvik stated he had not yet scheduled a meeting, but would send an email to members with dates to do so.

Pedestrian Signals – Mayor Miner had witnessed a dangerous situation as a pedestrian with a dog was crossing County Road 112 at a crossing sign, nobody was stopping for her, and when he stopped his vehicle the traffic behind him slammed on the brakes. He emphasized that crossing strongly warrants a lighted signal, and he could not understand why the County wouldn't install one at that location. Council and staff discussed moving forward with obtaining estimates for installing solar powered pedestrian safety crossing signals. Weske confirmed that he and Public Works Director Diercks would begin researching crossing signals and provide information to Council.

Bucket Truck and Crane Truck Purchases – Weske reported that staff had purchased a used bucket truck and gently used truck with a utility box and crane for a total of \$36,000, well under the Council's not to exceed budget of \$60,000 combined for the purchases. Both vehicles are F-450's, and the bucket on the bucket truck extends to 30 feet.

Hiring of Additional Public Works Employee – Mayor Miner questioned how to initiate the process to hire another Public Works full-time maintenance worker. Weske responded that he and Diercks had begun working on a position description and will be working towards bringing that in front of the Council to prepare for posting the position sooner rather than later. Staff has also begun looking at mowing equipment in preparation for making a recommendation to Council on a mowing equipment purchase as well.

Update on T-Mobile Lease Discussions – Council member Dyvik asked whether Weske had an update to share regarding lease negotiation discussions with T-Mobile. Weske replied that the City Attorney had reached out to T-Mobile, and at this time, no new information is available to report.

Fire Contract Update – Council member Kvale inquired whether there is an update on fire service contract negotiations. Mayor Miner indicated there are no new updates, but meetings have been scheduled with both Orono and Medina for dates in May.

Planning and Zoning Updates – Moeller indicated that staff is making progress on drafting new PUD ordinance language. Also, an application has been received for a Concept PUD from Charles Cudd for reorganization of three lots to permit construction of three new single family homes.

ADJOURN

Hearing no objection, Mayor Miner adjourned the meeting by general consent at 8:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Moeller
City Clerk